

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Support for the amendments to claim 1 are found in the specification as originally filed, for example at p. 18, l. 19 - p. 19, l. 16 and p. 19, l. 23 - p. 20, l. 27. Support for the amendments to claims 8-19 and 32-33 are found in the specification as originally filed, for example at p. 15, l. 1 - p. 19, l. 27. Support for the amendments to claims 27-30 may be found in the specification as originally filed, for example at p. 17, ll. 1-15. No new matter is added by the present amendments.

1. Claims 1-7 are Patentable over the Combination of Hruster and Brown.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a process wherein a downstream data packet is converted to one or more MPEG transport packets suitable for transmission to a digital STB in a selected downstream channel. The MPEG transport packets include a PN value of a video session to which the digital STB is tuned.

In contrast, Hraster (US 6324267) describes a system in which hosts (described as PCs or workstations) receive Internet communications via a cable network. To facilitate these communications, the IP packets from the internet are converted to a format suitable for transmission over the cable network; such format including a <channel, pipe, LinkID> triple. Nowhere, however, does Hraster suggest that this <channel, pipe, LinkID> triple is in any way related to a PN value of a video session to which the "host" is tuned.

The Office Action suggests it would have been obvious to replace Hraster's "host" with a digital STB as taught by Brown (US 6732179). Assuming for sake of argument that such a substitution is proper, the resulting combination would still not yield the present invention. For example, if one were to include Brown's STB in the communications network described by Hraster, one would end up with a system in which the data sessions described by Hraster would be directed to the <channel, pipe, LinkID> triple associated with the STB, but there would still be no teaching or suggestion that such an address is associated with a video session to which the STB is tuned, as recited in the present claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 are patentable over the combination of Hraster and Brown.

2. Claims 8-12 and 14-19 are Patentable over Smyth, even when Considered in Combination with Bauminger.

Claim 8, as amended, recites a process in which a data session is established between a digital set top box (STB) communicatively coupled to a hybrid fiber coax (HFC) network and an addressable Internet destination over a selected one of a number of downstream media transport channels adapted to communicate transport packets over the HFC network. Such a process is not taught by Smyth (US 2002/0007492). Instead, Smyth describes a system in which control channel modems (CCMs) are used to communicate with the various STBs over an HFC network. Neither the CCMs nor the session control manager to which they are communicatively coupled are addressable Internet destinations. Instead, these are nodes of the HFC network, reached via control signals from an STB after that STB has successfully contended for an upstream channel over that HFC network. See Smyth at p. 4 [0035]. Accordingly, claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-12 and 14-19 are patentable over Smyth.

Dependent claims 12 and 14 are further patentable over Smyth when considered in combination with Bauminger (US 6681393). The Office Action cites Bauminger for teaching overlaying a data image over a media image. Even if true, however, adding such teachings to those of Smyth will not cure the above described deficiencies. Hence, claims 12-14 remain patentable over this combination of references.

3. Claims 27-30 are Patentable over Hoarty, even even when Considered in Combination with Brodigan

Claim 27, as amended, recites a broad band multimeida router configured to encapsulate packets of media streams received from media sources coupled to the router within addressable packets for switching between inputs and outputs of the router. No such router is taught by Hoarty (US 6305020). Instead, Hoarty describes a routing system in which media information is switched from media source inputs to “personal multi-media modules (PMMs)”. Nothing suggests that any packet encapsulation is performed in this process. Hence, claims 27-30 are patentable over Hoarty.

In addition, dependent claims 29 and 30 are patentable over the combination of Hoarty and Brodigan (US 6530086). The Office Action cites Brodigan for teaching transmission of an IP address of a host computer assigned to a specific program channel and time associated with an STB. Even if true, however, combining such teachings with those of Hoarty would still not provide a broad band multimeida router configured to encapsulate packets of media streams received from media sources coupled to the router within addressable packets for switching between inputs and outputs of the router as recited in the parent claim 27. Hence, claims 29 and 30 are patentable over the combination of references.

4. Claims 32 and 33 are Patentable over Smyth.


Claim 32, as amended, recites a session manager and IP soft switch configured to establish a data session between an addressable broadband network destination communicatively coupled to the broadband multimedia router and an addressable Internet destination, in response to receiving downstream data session requests from the broadband network destination. Such a device is not taught by Smyth (US 2002/0007492). Instead, Smyth describes a system in which control channel modems (CCMs) are used to communicate with the various STBs over an HFC network. Neither the CCMs nor the session control manager to which they are communicatively coupled are addressable Internet destinations. Instead, these are nodes of the HFC network, reached via control signals from an STB after that STB has successfully contended for an upstream channel over that HFC network. See Smyth at p. 4 [0035]. Accordingly, claims 32 and 33 are patentable over Smyth.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: December 8, 2005



Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
(415) 882-5023